

REMARKS

Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for consideration of the subject patent application. This amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed December 7, 2006. Claims 1-13 are pending, claims 14-44 are canceled pursuant to a restriction requirement. Claims 1-13 stand rejected. Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly and distinctly claim the present invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0078104 to Matthies (hereinafter “*Matthies*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,359,666 to Hayashi (hereinafter “*Hayashi*”).

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly claim and distinguish the present invention. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the drivers are configured so that an individual driver is in communication with a corresponding sub-display within the pixel layer. Support for this amendment is found within the originally filed specification at page 4, line 3 and at page 5, lines 14 – 24. Providing a driver for each sub-display allows for shorter row and column connections associated with each driver in contrast to conventional large area displays, which use a common row or column electrode which spans the entire display (specification, page 1, lines 16-19). The reduced capacitance and resistance, enables faster switching speeds, in turn allowing larger displays to be created using a single continuous pixel layer sheet in accordance with embodiments of the present invention (specification, page 5, lines 14-24).

Neither *Matthies* nor *Hayashi*, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a large area display comprising “a pixel layer having a repeating pattern of sub-displays formed on a continuous pixel layer sheet” and “a plurality of drivers, each driver in communication with an associated sub-display,” as claimed in claim 1. As noted by the office action, *Matthies* fails to teach a continuous pixel layer sheet having a plurality of sub-displays, as claimed. *Hyashi* also fails to teach a continuous pixel layer sheet having a plurality of sub-displays, as claimed. While *Hayashi* appears to describe a process for fabricating a display by making multiple optical exposures of separate optical exposure regions of a substrate (FIG. 5, col. 1, lines 49-61), this does not produce separately driven sub-displays as recited by the present claim. In particular, claim 1 requires a driver to be associated with each sub-display. In contrast, *Hayashi* teaches

using common scanning and signal lines for the entire display (col. 6, lines 5-8). Accordingly, even when combined, *Matthies* and *Hyashi* fail to teach all of the elements of claim 1.

The Office Action also states that the reason to combine the teachings of *Hayashi* with *Matthies* is the “novel structure of wiring such as signal lines scanning lines and pixel electrodes formed on an array substrate (single sheet).” Such a motivation would not lead one of skill in the art to obtain the present invention. *Hayashi* teaches using common scanning and signal lines for the entire display (col. 6, lines 5-8). There is no recognition in *Hayashi*, however, that above a certain limit, the row and column lines become so long that parasitic capacitance limits the speed of the display. Accordingly, applying the teachings of *Hayashi* to the design of *Matthies*, while it may lead one to use a single connection layer for multiple sub-displays, would not lead one to associate a single driver with each sub display as claimed in the present application.

Matthies specifically teaches the undesirability of using large monolithic displays due to complexity. The large area display of *Matthies* is formed by coupling together a number of individual sub-display tiles (para 2). Modification of *Matthies* display to use a single pixel layer would go directly against *Matthies*’ teachings as to the desirability of building a large-area display out of smaller tiles (para 12). Accordingly the teachings of *Hayashi* and *Matthies*, even when considered together, would not motivate one of skill in the art to produce the presently claimed invention.

Claims 4-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Matthies* in view of *Hayashi* in combination with various other references. As these claims are all dependent from claim 1, they are allowable for at least the above reasons.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-13 are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejections and objections be withdrawn, and that the claims be allowed and passed to issue. If any impediment to the allowance of these claims remains after entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Steve M. Perry at (801) 566-6633 so that such matters may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee or to credit any overpayment in connection with this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

DATED this 12th day of February, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steve M. Perry/

Steve M. Perry
Registration No. 45,357

THORPE NORTH & WESTERN, LLP
Customer No. 20,551
P.O. Box 1219
Sandy, Utah 84091-1219
Telephone: (801) 566-6633